## **Shirl Storm**

From: Sent: Larry Obray [obrayla@msn.com] Sunday, March 07, 2010 8:39 PM

To: Subject: Julius Genachowski Comments to the Chairman FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 1 0 2010

Larry Obray (obrayla@msn.com) writes:

Federal Communications Commission Office of the Secretary

RE: FCC Declaratory Ruling: CG Docket No. 10-51, Feb. 25, 2010

I am disappointed with FCC's new retroactive ruling, especially since there has been a lot of discussion in the deaf community over the years that VRS providers have been having problems with FCC's inability in clarifying issues and being inactive. It seems like a perfunctory response. I certainly hope it isn't a case of malfeasance, i.e. similar to the recent SEC negligence that prompted deep economic woes.

The deaf community has been aware of the VRS providers (except for the largest) more or less breaking even and the fact that FCC's oversight over the years has prolonged critical clarification issues to the detriment of the providers and users.

It seems there has been a fine discriminate line between what is and isn't allowed by provider employees, especially for those who are unfortunately deaf, to have transparent access the nation's telephone system.

This involves an abuse for generations for the deaf community. Despite the advent of TRS and VRS, we obviously have false hopes of finally reaching better transparency due to FCC's inadequate and obstructive oversight.

We all want fair and orderly clarification and compensation for those who would finally provide what is hopefully such an invaluable service comparable with our hearing counterparts. Ever since this recent long over due service became a reality, it seems normal for growing pains and refinements in the process.

If FCC's intent is to finally, abruptly clarify new rulings and then make them retroactive to several years and disallow negotiations to rectify the issues regardless of if small providers are fortunate to have an financial ability to comply, especially with withholding policies and then forcing bankruptcy, then something is very wrong at FCC. Whatever happened to formal rule-making process involving consumer and provider participation? Is there intent to reduce service or create a monopoly?

I don't see FCC's conduct as Congress's intended provision for all individuals to communicate

No. of Copies rec J O

over the telephone system with hearing individuals in a functionally equivalent manner. FCC is narrowly restricting functional equivalency. We deaf obviously have a long ways to go to take advantage of all the access points our counterparts have had for years and years.

The extreme action of using new rules to withhold all previously due compensation regardless of whether it is related to questionable calls or not is an abuse of authority. Who is monitoring compliance with formal rule-making process involving consumer and provider participation and scrutinizing FCC violations of due process?

Just imagine what this process will have on the incentive innovation that only the smaller competing providers have been struggling to promote.

Hopefully, FCC will be able to foresee its mischievous impact toward the long neglected deaf community and will re-address the urgent issues to also protect our civil rights.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1 Remote host: 72.47.137.113

Remote IP address: 72,47,137,113

From:

Marilee Warren [slainte11@comcast, net]

Sent:

Monday, March 01, 2010 3:28 PM

To: Subject: Julius Genachowski; Michael Copps; Robert McDowell; Mignon Clyburn; Meredith Baker

DA 10-314

Chairman Julius Genachowski, Commissioner Michael Copps, Commissioner Robert McDowell, Commissioner Mignon Clyburn and Commissioner Meredith Attwell Baker:

MAR 1 0 2010

Secretary Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I am extremely concerned about the recent FCC ruling on February 25, 2010 (DA 10-314), as it could have negative ramifications to my many deaf friends. This is a civil rights setback toward the employment of people who are deaf, which could lead to reduced employment opportunities among the deaf in the VRS industry who serve their community.

Given this ruling, valuable companies such as Purple Communications could go out of business, and the deaf and hard of hearing community could potentially be left with a single, dominant provider without the opportunity to choose another provider that better fits their individual needs.

It is my understanding that Purple needs to repay the FCC retroactive payments based on the new ruling, which could financially devastate them as well as their many employees and other companies that rely on their business. I respectfully request that the FCC permit the release of funds owed Purple this week, allowing them to resolve any historical issues and my friends can continue using Purple – or any other VRS provider of their choosing.

Thank you very much for your time.

Sincerely,

Marilee Warren

505 Bates St. SE

Tumwater, WA 98501

## JOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINA'.

10-51 **Shirl Storm** 

From: Sent:

To:

Mark Stern [marklstern@gmail.com] Monday, March 01, 2010 3:52 PM Julius Genachowski; Michael Copps; Robert McDowell; Mignon Clyburn;

MeredithAttwell.Baker@fcc.gov

Subject:

Concerns about FCC Declaratory Ruling DA 10-314 on Practices of VRS Program

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 1 0 2010

Federal Communications Commission Office of the Secretary

No. of Copies rec d\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ List A B C D E

## **Shirl Storm**

From:

cornic@aol.com

Sent:

Wednesday, March 03, 2010 11:07 PM

To:

Robert McDowell; Julius Genachowski; Michael Copps; Mignon Clyburn; Meredith Baker

Subject:

Fwd: Urgent Request

mailto:miqnon.clyburn@fcc.gov

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 1 0 2010

Subject: DA 10-314

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Chairman Julius Genachowski, Commissioner Michael Copps, Commissioner Robert McDowell, Commissioner Mignon Clyburn and Commissioner Meredith Attwell Baker:

I am extremely concerned about the recent FCC ruling on February 25, 2010 (DA 10-314), as it could have negative ramifications to my many deaf friends. This is a civil rights setback toward the employment of people who are deaf, which could lead to reduced employment opportunities among the deaf in the VRS industry who serve their community.

Given this ruling, valuable companies such as Purple Communications could go out of business, and the deaf and hard of hearing community could potentially be left with a single, dominant provider without the opportunity to choose another provider that better fits their individual needs.

It is my understanding that Purple needs to repay the FCC retroactive payments based on the new ruling, which could financially devastate them as well as their many employees and other companies that rely on their business. I respectfully request that the FCC permit the release of funds owed Purple this week, allowing them to resolve any historical issues and my friends can continue using Purple – or any other VRS provider of their choosing.

Thank you very much for your time.

Sincerely,

Florene Johnson POB 12961 Olympia, WA. 98508

No. of Copies rec d O